arXiv:quant-ph/0201017v1 6 Jan 2002

Unspeakable quantum information

Asher Peres and Petra F. Scudo
Department of Physics, Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa, Israel

Abstract

No verbal explanation can indicate a direction in space or the orientation of a coordinate system. Only material objects can do it. In this article we consider the use of a set of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ particles in an entangled state for indicating a direction, or a hydrogen atom in a Rydberg state for transmitting a Cartesian frame. Optimal strategies are derived for the emission and detection of the quantum signals.

1 Formulation of the problem

The role of a dictionary is to define unknown words by means of known ones. However there are terms, like left or right, which cannot be explained in this way. In the absence of a formal definition, material objects must be used to illustrate these terms: for example, we may say that the human liver is on the right side. Likewise, the sign of helicity may be referred to the DNA structure, or to the properties of weak interactions.

Here we consider some cases where information cannot be explained verbally. The simplest one is when the emitter (conventionally called Alice) wants to indicate to the receiver (Bob) a direction in space. If they have a common coordinate system to which they can refer, or if they can create one by observing distant fixed stars, Alice simply communicates to Bob the components of a unit vector $\boldsymbol{n}$ along that direction, or its spherical coordinates θ and ϕ. But if no common coordinate system has been established, all she can do is to send a real physical object, such as a gyroscope, whose orientation is deemed stable.

2 Quantum transmission of a spatial direction

In the quantum world, the role of the gyroscope is played by a system with large spin. For example, Alice can send angular momentum eigenstates satisfying $\boldsymbol{n}\cdot\boldsymbol{J}|\psi\rangle = j|\psi\rangle$. This is essentially the solution proposed by Massar and Popescu [1] who took N parallel spins, polarized along $\boldsymbol{n}$. The fidelity of the transmission is usually defined as

$$F = \langle\cos^2(\chi/2)\rangle = (1 + \langle\cos\chi\rangle)/2, \tag{1}$$

where χ is the angle between the true $\boldsymbol{n}$ and the direction indicated by Bob's measurement. The physical meaning of F is that $1 - F = \langle \sin^2(\chi/2) \rangle$ is the mean square error of the measurement, if the error is defined as $\sin(\chi/2)$. [2] The experimenter's aim, minimizing the mean square error, is the same as maximizing fidelity. We can of course define "error" in a different way, and then fidelity becomes a different function of χ and optimization leads to different results [3]. Here, we shall take Eq. (1) as the definition of fidelity.

Massar and Popescu showed that for parallel spins, $1 - F = 1/(N+2)$. It then came as a surprise that for $N = 2$, parallel spins were not the optimal signal, and a slightly higher fidelity resulted from the use of opposite spins [4]. The intuitive reason given for this result was the use of a larger Hilbert space (four dimensions instead of three). This raises the question what is the most efficient signal state for N spins, whose Hilbert space has 2^N dimensions. Will F approach 1 exponentially? Actually, the optimal result is a quadratic approach, as shown below.

Our first task is to devise Bob's measuring method, whose mathematical representation is a positive operator-valued measure (POVM) [5,6]. For any unit vector $\boldsymbol{n}$, not necessarily Alice's direction, let $|j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle \equiv |j, m(\theta, \phi)\rangle$ denote the coherent angular momentum state [7] that satisfies

$$\boldsymbol{J}^2 \, |j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle = j(j+1) \, |j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle, \tag{2}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{J} \, |j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle = m \, |j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle. \tag{3}$$

We then have [7]

$$(2j+1) \int d_{\theta\phi} \, |j, m(\theta, \phi)\rangle \langle j, m(\theta, \phi)| = \mathbb{1}_j, \tag{4}$$

where

$$d_{\theta\phi} := \sin\theta d\theta \, d\phi / 4\pi, \tag{5}$$

and $\mathbb{1}_j$ is the projection operator over the $(2j{+}1)$-dimensional subspace spanned by the vectors $|j, m(\theta, \phi)\rangle$. If $N = 2$, so that j is 0 or 1, the two resulting subspaces span the whole 4-dimensional Hilbert space. For higher N, all the rotation group representations with $j < N/2$ occur more than once. We then have, if we take each j only once, from 0 or $\frac{1}{2}$ to $N/2$,

$$\sum (2j+1) = \frac{(N+2)^2}{4} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{(N+1)(N+3)}{4}, \tag{6}$$

for even or odd N, respectively. For large N, the dimensionality of the accessible Hilbert space tends to $N^2/4$, and this appears to be the reason that the optimal result for $1-F$ is quadratic in N, not exponential.

We now turn to the construction of Bob's POVM [5]. Let ρ denote the initial state of the physical system that is measured. All these input states span a subspace of Hilbert space. Let $\mathbb{1}$ denote the projection operator on that subspace. A POVM is a set of positive operators E_μ which sum up to $\mathbb{1}$. The index μ is just a label for the outcome of the measuring process. The probability of outcome μ is $\mathrm{tr}(\rho E_\mu)$. In the present case, μ stands for the pair of angles $\theta\phi$ that are indicated by Bob's measurement. If we want a high accuracy, these output angles should have many different values, spread over the unit sphere [8]. For example, the components of a continuous POVM, as in Eq. (4), are given by

$$E_{\theta\phi} = (2j+1)\, d_{\theta\phi}\, |j, m(\theta,\phi)\rangle\langle j, m(\theta,\phi)|. \tag{7}$$

Such a POVM with $m=j$ corresponds to the method of Massar and Popescu [1]. The choice $m=j$ is not optimal. As shown by Gisin and Popescu [4] for the case $N=2$, signal states with opposite spins give a higher fidelity. With our present notations, these states are $(|0,0\rangle + |1,0(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. They involve two values of j, but a single value of m, namely 0.

One possibility to include several values of j in a POVM is to take a sum of expressions like (4). This brings no advantage, because a convex combination of POVMs cannot yield more information than the best one of them [9]. Optimal POVM components are usually assumed to have rank one. In the present case, each one of them should include all relevant j:

$$E_{\theta\phi} := d_{\theta\phi}\, |\theta,\phi\rangle\langle\theta,\phi|, \tag{8}$$

where

$$|\theta,\phi\rangle := \sum_{j=m}^{N/2} \sqrt{2j+1}\; |j, m(\theta,\phi)\rangle. \tag{9}$$

To verify that this is indeed a POVM, we note that in $\int E_{\theta\phi}$ there are diagonal terms $(2j+1)|j,m(\theta,\phi)\rangle\langle j,m(\theta,\phi)|$, which give $\mathbb{1}_j$, owing to Eq. (4). The off-diagonal terms with $j_1 \neq j_2$ vanish, as can be seen by taking their matrix elements between $\langle j_1, m_1|$ and $|j_2, m_2\rangle$ in the standard basis where J_z is diagonal. We have [10]

$$\langle j_2, m(\theta,\phi)|j_2, m_2\rangle = \mathcal{D}^{(j_2)}_{mm_2}(\psi\theta\phi), \tag{10}$$

with a similar (complex conjugate) expression for $\langle j_1, m_1 | j_1, m(\theta,\phi)\rangle$. The rotation matrices $\mathcal{D}$ are explicitly given by

$$\mathcal{D}^{(j_2)}_{mm_2}(\psi\theta\phi) = e^{im\psi}\, d^{(j_2)}_{mm_2}(\theta)\, e^{im_2\phi}, \tag{11}$$

where the Euler angle ψ is related to an arbitrary phase which is implicit in the definition of $|j, m(\theta,\phi)\rangle$. Note that a single value of m occurs in all the components of the vectors $|\theta,\phi\rangle$ in Eq. (9), so that the undefined phases $e^{\pm im\psi}$ mutually cancel. It then follows from Eq. (4.6.1) of Edmonds [10] that all the off-diagonal matrix elements of $\int E_{\theta\phi}$ vanish, so that we indeed have a POVM [11].

While Bob's optimal POVM is essentially unique in the Hilbert space that we have chosen, Alice's signal state, which is

$$|A\rangle = \sum_{j=m}^{N/2} c_j\, |j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle, \tag{12}$$

contains unknown coefficients c_j. The latter are normalized,

$$\sum_{j=m}^{N/2} |c_j|^2 = 1, \tag{13}$$

but still have to be optimized.

The probability of detection of the pair of angles $\theta\phi$, indicated by the POVM component $E_{\theta\phi}$, is

$$\langle A|E_{\theta\phi}|A\rangle = d_{\theta\phi} \left| \sum_{j=m}^{N/2} c_j \sqrt{2j+1}\, \langle j, m(\theta,\phi) | j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle \right|^2 . \tag{14}$$

We have [7]

$$\langle j, m(\theta,\phi) | j, m(\boldsymbol{n})\rangle = e^{i\eta}\, d^{(j)}_{mm}(\chi), \tag{15}$$

where χ is the angle between the directions $\boldsymbol{n}$ and $\theta\phi$, and the phase $e^{i\eta}$ is related to the arbitrary phases which are implicit in the definitions of the state vectors in (15). The important point is that $e^{i\eta}$ does not depend on j and therefore is eliminated when we take the absolute value of the sum in Eq. (14). Explicitly, we have

$$d^{(j)}_{mm}(\chi) = \cos^{2m}(\chi/2)\, P^{(0,2m)}_{j-m}(\cos\chi), \tag{16}$$

where $P_n^{(a,b)}(x)$ is a Jacobi polynomial[7,10]. We shall write $x = \cos\chi$ for brevity, so that the fidelity is

$$F = (1 + \langle x \rangle)/2. \tag{17}$$

Our problem is to find the coefficients c_j that maximize $\langle x \rangle$. Owing to rotational symmetry, we can assume that Alice's direction $\boldsymbol{n}$ points toward the z-axis, so that $d_{\theta\phi}$ can be replaced by $dx/2$ after having performed the integration over ϕ. We thus obtain

$$\langle x \rangle = \tfrac{1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} x dx \left| \sum_{j=m}^{N/2} c_j \sqrt{2j+1} \left(\frac{1+x}{2} \right)^m P_{j-m}^{(0,2m)}(x) \right|^2 . \tag{18}$$

This integral can be evaluated explicitly by using the orthogonality and recurrence relations for Jacobi polynomials[12]. The result is

$$\langle x \rangle = \sum_{j,k} c_j^* \, c_k \, A_{jk}, \tag{19}$$

where A_{jk} is a real symmetric matrix, whose only nonvanishing elements are

$$A_{jj} = m^2/[j(j+1)], \tag{20}$$

and

$$A_{j,j-1} = A_{j-1,j} = (j^2 - m^2)/j\sqrt{4j^2-1}. \tag{21}$$

The optimal coefficients c_j are the components of the eigenvector of A_{jk} that corresponds to the largest eigenvalue, and the latter is $\langle x \rangle$ itself. For $m = 0$ (which is the optimal choice) and large N, we find that

$$1 - F \to [2.4048/(N+3)]^2, \tag{22}$$

where the numerator is the first zero of the Bessel function J_0.[13] The right hand side ought to be compared to the result of Massar and Popescu[1], which was $1/(N+2)$. A detailed comparison of both methods is illustrated by the figure which appears in a previous article[14].

3 Transmission of a Cartesiam frame

Next, we consider the quantum transmission of a complete Cartesian frame. If many spins are available, a simple possibility would be for Alice to use half of them for indicating her x axis and the other half for her y axis. However, the two directions found by Bob may not then be exactly perpendicular, because separate transmissions have independent errors due to limited angular resolution. Some adjustment will be needed to obtain Bob's best estimates for the x and y axes, before he can infer from them his guess of Alice's z direction. This method is not optimal, and it is obviously not possible to proceed in this way if a *single* quantum messenger is available. Here we shall show how a single hydrogen atom (formally, a spinless particle in a Coulomb potential) can transmit a complete frame.

Consider the n-th energy level of that atom (a Rydberg state). Its degeneracy is $d = n^2$ because the total angular momentum may take values $j = 0, \cdots, n-1$, and for each one of them $m = -j, \cdots, j$. Alice indicates her xyz axes by sending the atom in a state

$$|A\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sum_{m=-j}^{j} a_{jm} \, |j, m\rangle, \tag{23}$$

with normalized coefficients a_{jm} that will be specified below. Bob then performs a covariant measurement[15] in order to evaluate the Euler angles $\psi\theta\phi$ that would rotate his own xyz axes into a position parallel to Alice's axes. Bob's detectors (ideally, there is an infinite number of them[16]) have labels $\psi\theta\phi$ and the mathematical representation of his apparatus is as usual a POVM. In the present case, we have a resolution of identity by a set of positive operators:

$$\int d_{\psi\theta\phi} \, E(\psi\theta\phi) = \mathbb{1}, \tag{24}$$

where $d_{\psi\theta\phi} \equiv \sin\theta d\psi d\theta d\phi / 8\pi^2$ is the $SO(3)$ Haar measure for Euler angles[10], and $E(\psi\theta\phi) = |\psi\theta\phi\rangle\langle\psi\theta\phi|$. The vectors $|\psi\theta\phi\rangle$ will be specified below. The probability that the detector labelled $\psi\theta\phi$ is excited is given by

$$P(\psi\theta\phi) = \langle A | d_{\psi\theta\phi} E(\psi\theta\phi) | A\rangle = d_{\psi\theta\phi} \, |\langle A|\psi\theta\phi\rangle|^2. \tag{25}$$

Our task is to construct vectors $|\psi\theta\phi\rangle$ such that Eq. (24) is satisfied (that is, the probabilities sum up to one) and Bob's expected error is minimal.

Generalizing the method of the preceding section, we define a fiducial vector for Bob,

$$|B\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \sqrt{2j+1} \sum_{m=-j}^{j} b_{jm} \, |j, m\rangle, \tag{26}$$

where the coefficients b_{jm} are normalized for each j separately:

$$\sum_{m=-j}^{j} |b_{jm}|^2 = 1 \qquad \forall j. \tag{27}$$

For the preceding problem, a single value of m was used; here we need all the values. Note that Eq. (23) was written with Alice's notations (m is the angular momentum along her z axis), while Eq. (26) is written with Bob's notations (m refers to his z axis). This issue will be dealt with later.

We now define

$$|\psi\theta\phi\rangle = U(\psi\theta\phi)\,|B\rangle, \tag{28}$$

where $U(\psi\theta\phi)$ is the unitary operator for a rotation by Euler angles $\psi\theta\phi$. Note that since $|B\rangle$ is a direct sum of vectors, one for each value of j, then likewise $U(\psi\theta\phi)$ is a direct sum with one term for each irreducible representation,

$$U(\psi\theta\phi) = \sum_j \oplus \mathcal{D}^{(j)}(\psi\theta\phi), \tag{29}$$

where the $\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(\psi\theta\phi)$ are the usual irreducible unitary rotation matrices[10]. To prove that Eq. (24) is satified, we note that its left hand side is invariant if multiplied by $U(\mu\nu\rho)$ on the left and $U(\mu\nu\rho)^\dagger$ on the right, for any arbitrary Euler angles $\mu\nu\rho$ (because these unitary matrices represent group elements and therefore have the group multiplication properties)[7]. It then follows from a generalization of Schur's lemma[17] that the left hand side of (24) is a direct sum of *unit* matrices, owing to the presence of the factor $(2j+1)$ which is the dimensionality of the corresponding irreducible representation. Therefore Eq. (24) is satisfied.

The detection probability in Eq. (25) can thus be written as $P(\psi\theta\phi) = d_{\psi\theta\phi}\,|\langle A|U(\psi\theta\phi)|B\rangle|^2$. To compute this expression explicitly, we must use consistent notations for $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ — recall that Eq. (23) was written in Alice's basis, and Eq. (26) in Bob's basis. It is easier to rewrite Alice's vector $|A\rangle$ in Bob's language. For this we have to introduce the Euler angles $\xi\eta\zeta$ that rotate Bob's xyz axes into Alice's axes (that is, $\xi\eta\zeta$ are the true, but unknown values of the angles $\psi\theta\phi$ sought by Bob). The unitary matrix $U(\xi\eta\zeta)$ represents an *active* transformation of Bob's vectors into Alice's. Therefore, $U(\xi\eta\zeta)^\dagger$ is the *passive* transformation[5] from Bob's notations to those of Alice, and $U(\xi\eta\zeta)$ is the corresponding transformation from Alice's notations to Bob's. Written in Bob's notations, Alice's vector $|A\rangle$ becomes $U(\xi\eta\zeta)|A\rangle$ so that, in Eq. (25), $\langle A|$ becomes $\langle A|U(\xi\eta\zeta)^\dagger$. Let us therefore define

$$U(\alpha\beta\gamma) = U(\xi\eta\zeta)^\dagger\, U(\psi\theta\phi). \tag{30}$$

The Euler angles $\alpha\beta\gamma$ have the effect of rotating Bob's Cartesian frame into his *estimate* of Alice's frame, and then rotating back the result by the *true* rotation from Alice's to Bob's frame. That is, the angles $\alpha\beta\gamma$ indicate Bob's measurement error. The probability of that error is

$$P(\alpha\beta\gamma) = d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\, |\langle A|U(\alpha\beta\gamma)|B\rangle|^2, \tag{31}$$

where $d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \sin\beta d\alpha d\beta d\gamma/8\pi^2$. Note that in the above equation $|A\rangle$ is written with Alice's notations as in (23), and $|B\rangle$ with Bob's notations as in (26).

Of course Bob cannot know the values of $\alpha\beta\gamma$. His measurement only yields some value for $\psi\theta\phi$. The following calculation that employs $\alpha\beta\gamma$ has the sole purpose of estimating the expected accuracy of the transmission (which does not depend on the result $\psi\theta\phi$ owing to rotational symmetry).

We must now choose a suitable quantitative criterion for that accuracy. When a single direction is considered, it is convenient to define the error[2] as $\sin(\omega/2)$, where ω is the angle between the true direction and the one estimated by Bob. The mean square error is

$$\langle \sin^2(\omega/2)\rangle = (1 - \langle\cos\omega\rangle)/2 = 1 - F, \tag{32}$$

where F is the fidelity, as defined above. When we consider a Cartesian frame, we likewise define fidelities for each axis. Note that $\cos\omega_k$ (for the k-th axis) is given by the corresponding diagonal element of the orthogonal (classical) rotation matrix. Explicitly, we have[18]

$$\cos\omega_z = \cos\beta, \tag{33}$$

and

$$\cos\omega_x + \cos\omega_y = (1 + \cos\beta)\, \cos(\alpha + \gamma), \tag{34}$$

whence, by Euler's theorem,

$$\cos\omega_x + \cos\omega_y + \cos\omega_z = 1 + 2\cos\Omega, \tag{35}$$

where Ω has a simple physical meaning: it is the angle for carrying one frame into the other by a single rotation.

The expectation values of the above expressions are obtained with the help of Eq. (31):

$$\langle f(\alpha\beta\gamma)\rangle = \int d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\, |\langle A|U(\alpha\beta\gamma)|B\rangle|^2\, f(\alpha\beta\gamma), \tag{36}$$

where, explicitly,

$$\langle A|U(\alpha\beta\gamma)|B\rangle = \sum_{j,m,r} a^*_{jm}\, b_{jr} \langle j,m|\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(\alpha\beta\gamma)|j,r\rangle. \tag{37}$$

The unitary irreducible rotation matrices $\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ have components[10]

$$\langle j,m|\mathcal{D}^{(j)}(\alpha\beta\gamma)|j,r\rangle = e^{i(m\alpha+r\gamma)}\, d^{(j)}_{mr}(\beta), \tag{38}$$

where the $d^{(j)}_{mr}(\beta)$ can be expressed in terms of Jacobi polynomials. Collecting all these terms, we finally obtain, after many tedious analytical integrations over products of Jacobi polynomials[12],

$$\langle f(\alpha\beta\gamma)\rangle = \sum f_{jkmnrs}\, a^*_{jm}\, b_{jr}\, a_{kn}\, b^*_{ks}, \tag{39}$$

where the numerical coefficients f_{jkmnrs} depend on our choice of $f(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ in Eqs. (33–35). The problem is to optimize the components a_{jm} (normalized to 1), and b_{jm} satisfying the constraints (27), so as to maximize the above expression. For further use, it is convenient to define a matrix

$$M_{jm,kn} = \sum_{r,s} f_{jkmnrs}\, b_{jr}\, b^*_{ks}, \tag{40}$$

so that

$$\langle f(\alpha\beta\gamma)\rangle = \sum M_{jm,kn}\, a^*_{jm}\, a_{kn} = \langle A|M|A\rangle. \tag{41}$$

First consider a simple case: to transfer only the z axis, we wish to maximize $\langle\cos\beta\rangle$. An explicit calculation yields

$$f_{jkmnrs} = \delta_{mn}\, \delta_{rs}\, g_{jk}. \tag{42}$$

The matrix g_{jk} which is defined by the above equation has nonvanishing elements

$$g_{jj} = ns/[j(j+1)], \tag{43}$$

and

$$g_{j,j-1} = g_{j-1,j} = \frac{1}{j}\sqrt{\frac{(j^2-n^2)(j^2-s^2)}{4j^2-1}}. \tag{44}$$

The δ_{mn} term in (42) implies that, for any choice of Bob's fiducial vector $|B\rangle$, the matrix M in (41) is block-diagonal, with one block for each value of m. The optimization of Alice's signal results from the highest eigenvalue of that matrix. This is the highest eigenvalue of one of the blocks, so that a single value of m

is actually needed. A similar (slightly more complicated) argument applies if Alice's vector is given and we optimize Bob's fiducial vector. This result proves the correctness of the intuitive assumption that was made in our solution of the first problem, for which a single value of m was used. It was then found that when $m = 0$ (the optimal value) the expected error asymptotically behaves as $1.446/d$, where d is the effective number of Hilbert space dimensions. In the present case, $d = (j_{\max} + 1)^2$, which is the degeneracy of the n-th energy level.

If we want to transfer two axes, we use Eq. (34) and calculate the matrix elements for $\langle(1 + \cos\beta)\cos(\alpha + \gamma)\rangle$. (It is curious that they are simpler than those for $\langle\cos(\alpha + \gamma)\rangle$ alone.) We obtain

$$f_{jkmnrs} = \delta_{m,n-1}\,\delta_{r,s-1}\,h_{jk} + \delta_{n,m-1}\,\delta_{s,r-1}\,h_{kj}\,, \tag{45}$$

where the nonvanishing elements of h_{jk} are

$$\begin{aligned} h_{jj} &= \frac{[(j-n+1)(j+n)(j-s+1)(j+s)]^{1/2}}{2j(j+1)}, && (46)\\ h_{j,j-1} &= \frac{[(j-n+1)(j-n)(j-s+1)(j-s)]^{1/2}}{2j(4j^2-1)^{1/2}}, && (47)\\ h_{j-1,j} &= \frac{[(j+n-1)(j+n)(j+s-1)(j+s)]^{1/2}}{2j(4j^2-1)^{1/2}}. && (48) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the h_{jk} matrix, whose elements depend on n and s, is not symmetric (while g_{jk} was). This is because it comes from the operator $e^{i(\alpha+\gamma)}$ which is not Hermitian. However the two terms of (45) together, which corresponds to $\cos(\alpha+\gamma)$, have all the symmetries required by the other terms $a^*_{jm}\,b_{jr}\,a_{kn}\,b^*_{ks}$ in Eq. (39). Finally, if we wish to optimize directly the three Cartesian axes (without losing accuracy by inferring z from the approximate knowledge of x and y) we use all the terms of (35), that is, both those of (42) and of (45).

It now remains to find the vectors $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ that minimize the transmission error. For small values of j, we used Powell's method [19] without imposing any restrictions on $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ other than their normalization conditions. As intuitively expected, we found that the optimal vectors satisfy

$$b_{jm} = a_{jm}\left(\sum_n |a_{jn}|^2\right)^{-1/2}, \qquad \forall j. \tag{49}$$

This means that Bob's vector should look as much as possible as Alice's signal, subject to the restrictions imposed by the constraint (27).

Taking this property for granted is the key to a more efficient optimization method, as follows: assume any b_{jm}, so that the bilinear form (40) is known. Find its highest eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenvector a_{jm}. From the latter, get new components b_{jm} by means of (49), and repeat the process until it converges (actually, a few iterations are enough). Quantitative results are displayed in the figure of a preceding article[20]. That figure shows that there is little advantage in optimizing only two axes, if for any reason the third axis is deemed less important. If the three axes are simultaneously optimized, it can be shown[21] that the mean square error tends asymptotically to $1/\sqrt{d}$.

It is not surprising that this result is weaker than the one for a single axis, which was $1.446/d$. The obvious reason is that we are now transmitting a three-dimensional rotation operation that can be applied to any number of directions, not only to three orthogonal axes. Indeed, consider any set of unit vectors $\mathbf{e}_m^\mu$, where $m = 1, 2, 3$, and μ is a label for identifying the vectors. Let w_μ be a positive weight factor attached to each vector, indicating its importance. Let $R(\alpha\beta\gamma)$ be the classical orthogonal rotation matrix[18] for Euler angles $\alpha\beta\gamma$. Then the cosine of the angle between Bob's estimate of $\mathbf{e}_m^\mu$ and the true direction of that vector is

$$\cos\omega_\mu = \sum_{m,n} R_{mn}(\alpha\beta\gamma)\,\mathbf{e}_m^\mu\,\mathbf{e}_n^\mu. \tag{50}$$

With the same notations as before, we have

$$\langle f(\alpha\beta\gamma)\rangle = \sum_\mu w_\mu\,\langle\cos\omega_\mu\rangle = \sum_{m,n}\langle R_{mn}(\alpha\beta\gamma)\rangle\,C_{mn}, \tag{51}$$

where

$$C_{mn} = \sum_\mu w_\mu\,\mathbf{e}_m^\mu\,\mathbf{e}_n^\mu. \tag{52}$$

This is a positive matrix which depends only on the geometry of the set of vectors whose transmission is requested. We can now diagonalize C_{mn} and write it in terms of three orthogonal vectors, possibly with different weights. Therefore, no essentially new features follow from considering more than three directions.

Finally, we note that all the above calculations, as well as those in preceding works, assume that Alice and Bob have coordinate frames with the same chirality (this can be checked locally by using weak interactions). If the chiralities are opposite, then all the directions inferred by Bob should be reversed (because directions are polar vectors while spins are axial vectors).

In summary, we have shown that a single structureless quantum system (a point mass in a Coulomb potential) can transfer information on the orientation of a Cartesian coordinate system with arbitrary accuracy. At first sight, this conclusion seems surprising. No spherically symmetric classical object can achieve this result. Only those having an asymmetric internal structure, such as an asymmetric rigid body, can reliably transmit a Cartesian frame. However, a *classical* Kepler orbit has two vectorial constants of the motion: the angular momentum and the Lenz vector [18]. The Hamiltonian itself is spherically symmetric, but each elliptic orbit (each solution of the equations of motion) defines a unique Cartesian coordinate system. From the correspondence principle which is valid for large quantum numbers, we expect that there are sets of coefficients a_{jn} such that the wave function is concentrated in the vicinity of a classical elliptic orbit, and thereby defines a Cartesian system. This problem is under current investigation.

4 Covariant quantum measurements may not be optimal

In the preceding section, we discussed the transmission of a complete Cartesian frame by a single quantum messenger, namely a hydrogen atom (formally, a spinless particle in a Coulomb potential). A similar calculation was done by Bagan, Baig, and Muñoz-Tapia [21] (hereafter BBM), who were able to reach much higher values of j by sophisticated analytical methods. There is an essential difference between our work and that of BBM. We considered a single system, while BBM took N spins, and one irreducible representation for each value j of the total angular momentum. The maximum value is $j_{\max} = N/2$, and then the mathematics are the same as for our Rydberg state, with $j_{\max} = n - 1$. However, as explained above, if there are N spins that can be sent independently, there is a better method. Alice can use half of them to indicate one axis, and the other half for another axis. This method is far more accurate, especially if N is large. From Eq. (22), the mean square error for each axis is $5.783/(N/2)^2 = 23.13/N^2$, rather than $4/3N$ which is the result with the method used by BBM [21]. Similar results hold even for low values of N. Why is there such a discrepancy?

In all the works that were mentioned above, and in many other similar ones, it was assumed that Holevo's method of covariant measurements [15] gave optimal results. That method considers the case where Alice's signals are the orbit of a group $\mathcal{G}$, with elements g. Namely, if $|A\rangle$ is one of the signals, the others are $|A_g\rangle = U(g)|A\rangle$, where $U(g)$ is a unitary representation of the group element g. The problem is to find optimal quantum states for Alice's signals and Bob's detectors. Originally, Holevo considered only irreducible representations. Now we know that in some cases reducible representations are preferable[13,14]. However one then never needs to use more than one copy of each irreducible representation in the reducible one.

We now turn our attention to Bob. The mathematical representation of his apparatus is as always a POVM, namely a resolution of identity by a set of positive operators:

$$\sum_h E_h = \mathbb{1}, \tag{53}$$

where the label h indicates the outcome of Bob's experiment. In the case of *covariant* measurements, the labels h run over all the elements of the group $\mathcal{G}$ (with a suitable adjustment of the notation in the case of continuous groups). Then the probability that Bob's apparatus indicates group element h when Alice sent a signal $|A_g\rangle$ is

$$P(h|g) = \langle A_g|E_h|A_g\rangle. \tag{54}$$

The method of covariant measurements further assumes that E_h can be written as

$$E_h = |B_h\rangle\langle B_h|, \tag{55}$$

where

$$|B_h\rangle = U(h)|B\rangle. \tag{56}$$

Here, $|B\rangle$ is a fiducial vector for Bob (which has to be optimized) and $U(h)$ is a representation (possibly a direct sum of irreducible representations) of the same group $\mathcal{G}$ that Alice is using.

All this seems quite reasonable (and this indeed usually works well) but, as the above example shows, this may not be the optimal method. In the above example, Alice's signals $|A_g\rangle$, for all possible positions of her axes, are $SO(3)$ rotations of a fiducial state $|A\rangle$ with $j = 0, ..., n-1$. On the other hand Bob uses two separate POVMs, each one testing only one half of the spins. Each one of these POVMs also involves $SO(3)$, but with lower values of the maximal j. Further discussion of this topic will appear in a forthcoming publication[22].

Work by AP was supported by the Gerard Swope Fund and the Fund for Encouragement of Research. PFS was supported by a grant from the Technion Graduate School.

References

1. S. Massar and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 1259 (1995).
2. C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976) p. 248.
3. S. Massar, *Phys. Rev.* A **62**, 040101(R) (2000).
4. N. Gisin and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 432 (1999).
5. A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1995).
6. Owing to Gleason's theorem, any detection procedure is mathematically represented by a POVM. However, quantum mechanics is only a theoretical framework and it does not tell how to actually build the corresponding experimental setup. Likewise, Maxwell's equations do not say how to build an electric motor, and thermodynamics does not tell how to build steam engines.
7. A. M. Perelomov, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **26**, 222 (1972).
8. If $N \leq 4$, an optimal POVM can have a finite number of components, corresponding to the vertices of regular polyhedra. In general, a POVM with a nonuniform distribution of directions on the unit sphere can be converted into a uniform one by rotational symmetrization. This does not affect the fidelity of transmission if the input is uniform. We can therefore assume that the POVM distribution is uniform without loss of generality. (See also ref. 16.)
9. A convex combination of POVMs, such as $E_\mu = \sum w_k E_{k\mu}$, with $w_k > 0$ and $\sum w_k = 1$, has the physical meaning that each one of the sets $\{E_{k\mu}\}$ is chosen by the experimenter with probability w_k.
10. A. R. Edmonds, *Angular Momentum in Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1957).
11. More generally we can take $|\theta,\phi\rangle = \sum_j \sqrt{2j+1} \sum_m b_{jm} |j, m(\theta,\phi)\rangle$, with $\sum_m |b_{jm}|^2 = 1$ for each j. Likewise, Alice's signal state (12) may include all j and all m. In that case, it can be proved that fidelity is optimal if a single value of m is used.
12. E. D. Rainville, *Special Functions* (MacMillan, New York, 1960).
13. E. Bagan, M. Baig, A. Brey, R. Muñoz-Tapia, and R. Tarrach, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 5230 (2000); *Phys. Rev.* A **63**, 052309 (2001).
14. A. Peres and P. F. Scudo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4160 (2001).
15. A. S. Holevo, *Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1982), Chap. 4.
16. In any real experiment, the number of detectors must be finite. It can be shown that a finite POVM with $4n^3$ detectors can give the same angular

resolution as obtained here. Instead of continuous integrals, there are $2n$ equidistant values for ψ and for ϕ, and an n-point Gaussian integration is performed over $\cos\theta$. Another method is presented by E. Bagan, M. Baig, and R. Muñoz-Tapia, *Phys. Rev.* A **64**, 022305 (2001).

17. E. Wigner, *Group Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1959) p. 76.
18. H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1980).
19. W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vettering, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).
20. A. Peres and P. F. Scudo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 167901 (2001).
21. E. Bagan, M. Baig, and R. Muñoz-Tapia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 257903 (2001).
22. A. Peres and P. F. Scudo, *J. Modern Optics* **49**, ... (2002).